

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

TARREN CLARK and  
OMG INVESTMENTS,<sup>1</sup>

Plaintiffs,

v.

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY,  
et al.,

Defendants.

No. 4:10CV200 MLM

**OPINION, MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon the motion of plaintiff for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Upon consideration of the financial information provided with the motion, the Court finds that plaintiff is financially unable to pay any portion of the filing fee. As a result, plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Additionally, the Court has reviewed the complaint and will dismiss it pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

---

<sup>1</sup>Plaintiff Tarren Clark has listed “OMG Investments” as an additional plaintiff in this case and signed his complaint “Tarren Clark, OMG Investments.” However, there are no allegations in the complaint regarding OMG Investments, and there is no explanation of what type of relationship, if any, plaintiff has with OMG Investments. Accordingly, plaintiff OMG Investments will be dismissed.

## **28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if it “lacks an arguable basis in either law or fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action is malicious if it is undertaken for the purpose of harassing the named defendants and not for the purpose of vindicating a cognizable right. *Spencer v. Rhodes*, 656 F. Supp. 458, 461-63 (E.D.N.C. 1987), *aff’d* 826 F.2d 1059 (4th Cir. 1987).

To determine whether an action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court must engage in a two-step inquiry. First, the Court must identify the allegations in the complaint that are not entitled to the assumption of truth. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1950-51 (2009). These include “legal conclusions” and “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action [that are] supported by mere conclusory statements.” *Id.* at 1949. Second, the Court must determine whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief. *Id.* at 1950-51. This is a “context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.” *Id.* at 1950. The plaintiff is required to plead facts that show more than the “mere possibility of misconduct.” *Id.* The Court must review the factual allegations

in the complaint “to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief.” *Id.* at 1951. When faced with alternative explanations for the alleged misconduct, the Court may exercise its judgment in determining whether plaintiff’s conclusion is the most plausible or whether it is more likely that no misconduct occurred. *Id.* at 1950, 51-52.

### **The Complaint**

Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging “conspiracy, defamation of character, intentional infliction of emotional distress, discrimination, slander, etc.” Plaintiff has named eighteen different defendants in this action, including: Wake Forest University, Forsyth County, NC, Forsyth County Jail, James Rae, Unknown Brown, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Washington University, Don Moore, State of Missouri, St. Louis County, St. Louis County Public Defenders Office, St. Louis County Prosecutors, St. Louis County District Attorney, St. Louis County Jail, Eastern Reception Diagnostic Department, Missouri Eastern Correctional Center, City of Hazelwood, and City of St. Ann.

Plaintiff’s complaint is long, rambling and incoherent. He seems to be alleging that all of the defendants violated numerous state laws, as far back as 1996 when he was allegedly a student at Wake Forest University. His claims are numerous,

disjointed, unorganized and incomprehensible, and many are decidedly not cognizable under § 1983.

### **Discussion**

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require litigants to formulate their pleadings in an organized and comprehensible manner. Even pro se litigants are obligated to plead specific facts and proper jurisdiction and must abide by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; however, plaintiff has failed to do so in this case. *See U.S. v. Wilkes*, 20 F.3d 651, 653 (5th Cir. 1994); *Boswell v. Honorable Governor of Texas*, 138 F.Supp.2d 782, 785 (N.D. Texas 2000); Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2)(complaint should contain "short and plain statement" of claims); Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(e)(2)(each claim shall be "simple, concise, and direct"); Fed.R.Civ.P. 10(b)(parties are to separate their claims within their pleadings "the contents of which shall be limited as far as practicable to a single set of circumstances").

Although the Court is to give plaintiff's complaint the benefit of a liberal construction, the Court will not create facts or claims that have not been alleged. Plaintiff is required, to the best of his ability, to set out not only his alleged claims in a simple, concise, and direct manner, but also the facts supporting his claims as to each named defendant. Because plaintiff has failed to do so, and the instant complaint is

nonsensical, disorganized, and incomprehensible, the Court will dismiss this action as legally frivolous.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff OMG Investments is dismissed from this action.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is legally frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or both.

An appropriate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 17th day of March, 2010.



---

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE